

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 3, 6, 11 and 13-16 have been amended. Claims 7-10 have been cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, claims 1-6 and 11-16 now are presented for examination.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claims 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claim 11 has been amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 and its independent claims 12-13.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully submit that the support for the limitation in claim 11 of “. . . allocating processing slots based on a priority of threads” is found in the Specification on page 5, lines 14-16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11-13 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claim 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yue, U.S. Patent No. 5,987,492, (“Yue”).

Applicants respectfully submit that Yue discloses a method “for implementing proportional sharing in a single processor system and/or in a multi-processor system.” (Abstract). Yue further discloses that “each process is *assigned a number of ‘slots’ equal . . . to the number of processors in the system.*” (col. 9, lines 64-67; emphasis provided).

In contrast, claim 11, in pertinent part, recites “allocating a plurality of processing slots on a processor based on a priority of multiple threads.” (emphasis provided). Yue assigns slots based on the number of processors in the system (see col. 5, lines 64-67), which is not equivalent to allocating slots based on the priority of the threads. (see claim 11). Even though Yue discloses assigning slots, Applicants submit that Yue does not teach or reasonably suggest “allocating a plurality of processing slots on a processor based on a priority of multiple threads” as recited by claim 11. (emphasis provided). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 and its dependant claims.

Claims 1, 5, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Montpetit, U.S. Patent No. 6,366,761, (“Montpetit”).

Applicants respectfully submit that Montpetit discloses “[a] data communications system . . . that allocates an amount of bandwidth to a ground terminal for uplink transmission . . . packets in a low-Earth-orbit (LEO) satellite data communications network.” (Abstract). Montpetit further discloses that “[a] *hierarchy of priority status levels is provided to assist the network in providing the four quality of service classes.* [The] four levels of priority status are defined and *denoted as P1, P2, P3 and P4.*” (col. 5, line 65 – col. 6, line 2; emphasis provided).

In contrast, claim 1, in pertinent part, recites “allocating a plurality of processing slots based on respective priorities of the respective client systems.” (emphasis provided). Montpetit discloses priority levels to assist a network in providing quality of service classes (see col. 5, lines 65-67); however, Montpetit does not teach or reasonably suggest the allocating of slots. (see claim 1). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully

request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependant claims.

Claim 14 contains limitations similar to those of claims 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 and its dependent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 2-4, 6, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over (“Montpetit”).

With regard to claims 2-4, 6, 15 and 16, they depend from one of independent claims 1 and 14 and thus, include the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4, 6, 15 and 16.

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over (“Yue”).

With regard to claims 12 and 13, they depend from independent claim 11 and thus, include the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12 and 13.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.